



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND ABSTRACTS.

Letter to the Journal on improved industrial conditions prevailing in the establishment of the John B. Stetson Co., Philadelphia (felt-hat manufacturers).—The factory has been organized and conducted for many years on the broadest principles of humanity. In the effort to reach this end, we have approached the subject with a care that we can only describe as having been born of experience.

Our apprentices are required to serve full four years of actual service before becoming journeymen. During this time we feel that they are more or less under our control and supervision, and that we are in a large degree responsible for the habits they form while here. Every precaution is taken, therefore, from the time that an apprentice enters the factory to surround him with all possible chances of improvement, mentally, physically, and morally.

In order that the employees may be brought into touch with moral influences, a large auditorium in the factory is completely fitted up with parlor organ, grand organ, piano, and other appliances as a Sunday-school room. The school is divided into main, intermediate, primary, and kindergarten departments, to meet the requirements of scholars of all ages. Class-rooms within this room make it possible to have here a school with a capacity of fourteen hundred. The Christian Endeavor and Choral Societies connected with the school are both flourishing organizations. The library furnishes the best literature of the day.

A prayer meeting, peculiar to this factory, is held weekly on Friday at noon-day in the auditorium, where the apprentices and workpeople (men, women, boys, and girls) are assembled for half an hour, and the time is devoted to music, singing, prayer, reading of the Scripture, and such talks or addresses as are calculated to be of moral and spiritual benefit. The auditorium is frequently used for evening concerts, literary entertainments, and lectures for the workpeople and their friends. The talent on many occasions is selected from the employees.

One of the most important organizations connected with the place is the John B. Stetson Building Association, which is conducted entirely by the operatives, and which has been in operation for nineteen years, with uniform success. Many of our people, through the medium of this association, have become the owners of homes which are now entirely clear and paid for solely by connection with this association.

In addition to this, we have the Stetson Saving Fund, which gathers the smaller amounts not handled by the building association. There is, however, a limitation on deposits in the saving fund to such portions of the weekly earnings of each person as the managers believe it is possible for depositors to permit to remain for their future use. The company receives these deposits and allows interest on them at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum. In order to prevent the withdrawal of deposits without full and proper consideration, it has been deemed wise, in case of depositors desiring to withdraw before the end of the fiscal year, to permit them to do so by losing the accumulated interest thereon.

The Beneficial Fund is also an institution which deserves some notice. It is supported by a contribution from each worker of 25 cents per month, unless it be an apprentice under eighteen years of age, in which case the amount is 15 cents per month. This secures a fund which is applicable to those who may be sick and unable to attend to business; \$5 per week for five weeks in a year is paid to those over eighteen years of age; \$3 per week to those under eighteen years. In case of death, \$100 is allotted to those over eighteen years; \$75 to those under eighteen. This fund has proved sufficient to meet all the purposes of the object for which it was created.

The company, in the management of its business, has endeavored to furnish as much light and air as it is possible to obtain, with commodious quarters and latest

improved machinery (made in the factory by our own workmen) for the operatives, and a great deal of trouble and expense has been incurred in the effort to secure such surroundings for the comfort and health of the workpeople. Cleanliness is one of the laws of the place. Every department throughout the factory, no matter what may be the work carried on therein, is required to be constantly clean and tidy.

Three years ago, in order to produce greater efficiency in the sizing department, an investment of 5 per cent. additional on the workmen's wages was deemed advisable. This proved of such great advantage that the amount was increased to 10 per cent. the second year, and this year to 15 per cent., and the efficiency of the department has increased 48, 60, and 80 per cent.

A system of rewards for merit is prevalent throughout the factory. Workmen in all classes are liable to be benefited at Christmas by being the recipients of rewards for extra duty performed, for good work, or for good conduct throughout the year. These favors are largely paid in gold, several thousand dollars being disbursed each Christmas on this account. The prizes range from \$100 downward; nothing less than \$2.50 is given.

Individual accounts are kept with all workmen in the place, so that, by actual comparison, justice without partiality is shown.

The Union Mission Hospital, connected with the factory, is fully equipped with all modern appliances for the most effective work. Thousands of cases have been treated there during the past ten years. Its services are free and entirely under the control of the John B. Stetson Co.

Many of our workmen have been in the employ of the company since its foundation, or from twenty to thirty years. Many of their sons and daughters are among the two thousand employees in our workshops. Our experienced hatters frequently find it convenient for their sons to learn the trade of their fathers, and apprentice their boys to the company. Under our system, we take on apprentices from time to time as required, each one serving the full four years, insuring excellent journeymen and finally expert hatters.

These efforts as outlined have resulted, not only in the moral, social, physical, and spiritual uplifting of our employees, but also in great improvement in the quality and quantity of their work, and in substantial increase in the company's business and profits.

Divorces in Berlin and Elsewhere.—The number of divorces in Berlin has shown a marked increase since 1893. For the period 1891-93 the number of divorces per 1,000 married couples in the city was 3.5. For the period 1894-96 it was 4.35. For the year 1897 it was 4.71, and for 1898, 4.43.

Divorces are far more common in Berlin than in Prussia as a whole. For Prussia the number per 1,000 marriages in force was: 1881-85, 0.67; 1886-90, 0.8; 1891-95, 0.87.

The figures for Paris and Hamburg are very high, but not so high as those for Berlin. In Paris the divorces per 1,000 marriages in force were, for 1881-85, 1.9; for 1886-90, 2.08; and in Hamburg for these periods, 2.42 and 3.04. Per 1,000 marriages solemnized during the period 1896-97 there were in Berlin 75.3 divorces and in Paris 67. Per 1,000 marriages in 1877-86 Vienna had 1.86 divorces, and Stockholm, the "Paris of the North," had for 1871-80, 2.32.

The increase in divorces is general, as shown by the following table of divorces per 1,000 marriages in force:

	France.	Nether- lands.	England and Wales.	Sweden.	Italy.
1871-75.....	0.25	0.04	0.25	0.13
1876-80.....	0.32	0.06	0.28	0.12
1881-85...	0.42	0.41	0.07	0.29	0.11
1886-90... ..	0.57	0.65	0.07	0.32	0.11
1891-95.....	0.81	0.70	0.11
1896-97.....	0.94	0.80 to 1899	0.12

In Italy the figures are stationary, and in Switzerland, where the proportion of divorces is greatest, there is diminution, the figures on the above basis, for four periods

of five years each, and a fifth of four years, extending from 1876 to 1899, being 2.2, 2, 1.88, 1.85, 2.12.

Outside Switzerland only Denmark and the kingdom of Saxony approach these figures, the former with 1.71 for 1871-80, the latter with 1.56 for 1881-90.

In Japan divorce is exceedingly common, depending only on the will of the injured party. There the figures on the same basis were for 1892-96, 14.87, and for 1897, 15.72.

In the United States there are more divorces than in all the rest of Christendom together. The negroes largely swell the number. The legislation of the different states varies widely. According to Carrol D. Wright, there was in 1867-86 one divorce to every 11.32 marriages in Connecticut, one to every 30.83 in Columbia, 31.28 in Massachusetts, 20.65 in Ohio, 11.11 in Rhode Island, 19.96 in Vermont.

The difference in the commonness of divorce in different countries is due chiefly to the creeds in vogue and the laws in force. The Greek church permits divorce according to the rule of Justinian. The Catholic church permits it on no account, not even for adultery. In France in 1884 "divorce counter to the will of the church" was introduced. In Berlin the number of divorces in 1894-97 per 1,000 marriages in force was, when the marriage was Evangelical, 4.61; when it was Catholic, 3.34; when it was Jewish, 3.15. Mixed marriages are much more likely to result in divorce. In Berlin, during the same years, the divorces per 1,000 mixed marriages in force were:

Between Evangelical men and Catholic women	-	-	-	-	-	6.48
Between Catholic men and Evangelical women	-	-	-	-	-	5.49
Between Christian men and Jewish women	-	-	-	-	-	10.00
Between Jewish men and Christian women	-	-	-	-	-	11.47

Keeping in mind the differences of creeds, laws, and moral sentiments of peoples and of judges, an investigator of the causes of increase in divorces must turn to the grounds upon which divorces are granted. The figures in the following table show the number of divorces granted, upon each of the grounds named, in Berlin per 100,000 marriages in force:

	1885-89	1890-92	1893-95	1896-98
Adultery	112.0	111.6	147.8	154.6
Malicious desertion	95.1	60.9	60.9	72.5
Renunciation of marriage vow	0.9	0.7	1.5	1.1
Sickness, impotence	0.5	0.7	0.2	0.4
Insanity	6.2	5.2	5.0	7.7
Plot, abuse, insult	25.3	14.2	29.4	39.8
Criminal sentence	11.9	11.7	19.6	21.4
Drunkenness	2.7	1.6	0.4	0.7
Disorderly life	0.5	1.7	1.5	1.3
Destitution	8.0	6.6	8.5	13.0
Unconquerable aversion	14.9	18.6	18.9	10.0
Mutual agreement	64.7	73.3	89.5	133.9
Voidness of the marriage	1.4	1.2	0.8	1.0
Total	345.0	308.0	384.0	458.0

The increase in the total number of divorces falls mostly under the head "divorce by mutual agreement." This proves that judges grant divorce more easily than formerly. For the six years ending with 1898 the numbers granted on this ground were respectively 173, 302, 324, 416, 457, 390. Couples divorced on this ground are almost always childless. In 1897 and 1898 there was but one exception to this rule, and in that instance there was but one child.

Adultery is also increasingly a cause of divorce in Berlin. In 1897-98 there were 985 divorces on this ground. In 491 cases the man was guilty, in 328 the woman, and in 166 both.

In the United States 29,655 divorces in 1867-86 were investigated to determine whether intemperance were directly or indirectly the cause. Intemperance was proved in one-third of the cases.

Children are the best preventive of voluntary divorce. In Berlin, 1897-98, in 100 divorces the surviving children were as follows: no children, 54 per cent.; 1 child, 21.3 per cent.; 2 children, 13.8 per cent.; 3 children, 6 per cent.; 4 children,

2.6 per cent.; 5 children, 1.1 per cent.; 6 children, 1 per cent.; no statement, 0.2 per cent. In 1885 about one-fifth of the married couples in Berlin had *never had* a child.

The largest number of divorces falls about the sixth or seventh year after marriage. In Berlin, 1895-98, per 100 divorces:

Within 2 years of marriage were	- - - - -	5.8
Within 2-5 years of marriage were	- - - - -	18.7
Within 5-7 years of marriage were	- - - - -	33.7
Within 10-15 years of marriage were	- - - - -	21.2
Within 15-20 years of marriage were	- - - - -	10.8
Within 20-25 years of marriage were	- - - - -	6.5
Within 25-30 years of marriage were	- - - - -	2.2
After 30 years of marriage were	- - - - -	1.1

Divorce following close upon marriage is morally the most reprehensible. And such divorce has of late seriously increased in Berlin. During 1895-96, 4.26 per cent. of all divorces followed within two years of marriage; in 1897-98, 7.20 per cent.

The ages of the divorced in Berlin, Paris, and all France appear below:

Per cent.	BERLIN, 1897-98.		PARIS, 1896-97.		FRANCE, 1896-97.	
	Men.	Women.	Men.	Women.	Men.	Women.
Under 20 years	0.2	..	0.5	0.2	1.1
20-25 years	0.9	7.1	0.9	10.9	2.0	10.5
25-30 years	12.0	19.5	11.7	26.2	12.1	22.8
30-35 years	24.4	24.1	28.5	26.9	24.2	24.5
35-40 years	23.0	19.8	26.9	18.1	24.6	18.9
40-50 years	27.2	20.8	22.6	13.0	25.7	16.5
50 years and over	11.6	7.4	9.4	4.4	11.2	5.7
Not stated	0.9	1.1

Of special sociological interest is the question whether divorces are oftener of those who married young or those who married late. The number of men and of women divorced in Berlin, 1892-98, who had been married at the ages given in the following table, was, to each 100 united in marriage at the same age during the same period, as follows:

Married.	Men.	Women.	Married.	Men.	Women.
Under 20 years	68.3	12.5	40-45 years	6.3	6.0
20-25 years	8.8	6.9	45-50 years	6.4	6.7
25-30 years	6.1	5.7	50-55 years	5.1	5.7
30-35 years	6.2	5.6	55-60 years	4.4	6.5
35-40 years	6.1	5.7	60 years and over	3.7	1.5

The frequency of divorce increases with the size of the city. The following figures show the divorces per 1,000 inhabitants in French cities:

	1887-90.	1891-94.	1895-97.
Paris	0.46	0.52	0.61
Other cities with over 100,000	0.28	0.35	0.36
Cities of 30,000-100,000	0.24	0.28	0.32
Cities of 20,000-30,000	0.17	0.21	0.26
Cities of 10,000-20,000	0.15	0.21	0.22
Cities of 5,000-10,000	0.16	0.17
In all cities over 5,000	0.30	0.34
In all France as a whole	0.12	0.16	0.18

That many divorces could be avoided if the parties would wait longer before acting is illustrated by the fact that reunions of previously divorced couples annually take place. There were twenty-two such reunions in Berlin in 1897 and 1898.

Divorce for the purpose of marrying a third person is utterly without moral justification. The number of those who married within a year after being divorced were, in Berlin :

	Men.	Women.	Whole Number of Divorces.
In 1895	277	135	1,376
In 1897	285	152	1,482
In 1898	293	161	1,447

That is, 20 per cent. of the divorced men and 14 per cent. of the divorced women are married to another within a year. Of these it is safe to conclude that the new marriage was the motive for the divorce. In 1898, 190 men and 76 women married another within six months after divorce.—DR. FRIEDRICH PRINZING, in *Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft*. E. C. H.

The Social Reality.—Intermental psychology is not all there is of sociology; and not all inter-mental relations are social. Hate and misunderstanding are anti-social. Yet even these by their indirect and ultimate effects can extend the social bond. Directly or indirectly interspiritual action has social connection for its effect. How does this effect differ from this course? Or, does our point of view confound sociology with social psychology—which is, after all, only one case of individual psychology? And if they differ, what is the nature of the social reality?

Social psychology studies only the subjective side of social facts. Collective psychology explains the social reality; but that reality includes the grouping of human organisms, not of disembodied spirits, and it includes the groupings of spirits, and not only the interspiritual actions that produce these groupings. Social psychology studies only spiritual relations of associates; there remain to be studied their corporeal relations, and their common relations with the soil and the forces of nature.

Societies with their spiritual and corporeal elements are not mere collections, but systematic co-ordinations, and as such form an objective for a study having a method distinct from that of social psychology. Society is an object as real as matter is for the chemist or life for the biologist. But a sense of this reality has, unfortunately, suggested the idea of the social organism. To abandon that metaphor is not to lose that reality. The Nile or the Ganges is a reality, though its waters are constantly passing and renewed. A society is a reality, of a far higher kind, as its molecules are interrelated in ways vastly more numerous and more effective than are the molecules of water in a river, and in each soul-molecule of a society is an idea which is a more or less complete and exact reflection of the social whole. Society is not a mere arithmetical total, a sum of parts having only external relations. A sum is a unit only because its parts are thought together by some observer. But a chemically united whole, an astronomic whole, a solar system, a mechanical whole, a machine, and still more an organic whole, is a real objective somewhat. Likewise a social whole does not have to be thought of as a whole in order actually to exist as such.

A sentiment, principle, or plan, at first individual and subjective, spreading and consolidating among associates, becomes an objective thing, it collides with the individuality of each associate. And the states of mind of each, in proportion as he is influential, become objective, and real. Such is the social reality. Little by little the objectified idea may grow far too great to be lightly manipulated by an individual, as, for example, a religion or other social institution. It is no longer an individual thing, it has become a social reality.

The social reality is a simultaneity and similarity of multiple cerebral impressions, produced by accumulation and consolidation of individual actions. It is built up of psychic states. The scattering of members which would dissociate them from an organism leaves them in a society so long as the psychic bond remains. A Frenchman at the antipodes of France is a Frenchman still.

In proportion as societies become civilized they become truly realized. In the same proportion, however, it becomes difficult, nay impossible, to formulate laws according to which their further evolution will proceed. Societies are not on this account withdrawn from the possibility of scientific study. I do not comprehend the importance that seems to be attached to that which is wholly explicable by laws and by laws alone. Every series of repetitions formulated by a law began with a relatively spontaneous act upon which all the rest hangs as a chain upon its first link. These initial acts, far from being explicable by laws, alone explain the laws. This compels the further admission of the possibility of frequent intervention of initiations that are *not* primordial, of an ordinary spontaneity, autonomy, "liberty," within the woof of the natural laws. Discussions of invention and imitation have on this account an interest not merely social. These facts belong to a vast genus, one species of which is the field for the discussions about determinism and liberty. Upon this problem our method of approach casts light. Liberty we need not understand in the scholastic sense of "arbitrary freedom." Instead of freedom let us use the phrase "originality," "diversity." Here we shall recognize a side of things that must be taken into account in order to explain, not history alone, but all nature. As to what one believes and desires, in a given environment, he is no more free than as to what he sees when he opens his eyes on a given landscape. And the idea of the radical diversity of persons explains the facts attributed to the scholastic notion of freedom. This diversity of persons is inexplicable, for it is that which explains everything.

What, then, is society? It is not only the social spirit, but it is, first of all, the social spirit. Each of the special social sciences—of which general sociology is but the synthesis—embraces both a given order of interspiritual and a given order of intercorporeal actions. The essence of social progress is rendering the interspiritual action more predominant compared with the intercorporeal. "Is not this social evolution: to multiply and diversify men's interspiritual action, while reducing and simplifying their intercorporeal action, and this by means of the more and more varied and powerful action which they together exert upon the rest of nature, tamed and domesticated?" Let men stop fighting and enslaving one another.

We can see the birth of societies beneath our eyes, not only in watching the development of the child, but also in observing the formation of a crowd. The people in the street are strangers mentally, but all hearts beat in unison at the cry of fire. The rabble becomes a monstrous being when Camille Desmoulius, mounted on a chair, shouts: "Prendre la Bastille!" This first degree of human association (outside the family), the crowd, is always an affair of sympathy. Its essence is that which passes from man to men, and is expressed by similar acts, be they shouts, gestures, throwing of stones, or what not. It is useful to the herd of beasts or crowd of men that certain sentiments spread quickly. But its utility is not the sole cause of the development. Its utility is occasional, but the primitive pleasure of sympathy is constant. From this rudiment societies may vary to a maximum of numbers, territorial extent, duration, and cohesiveness limited only by the means of spiritual interaction, including speeds, tradition, writing, printing, the post, and telegraph. The characteristic of the city is less the number of its population than the closeness of their interrelations.

"The social organism is only a metaphor, but the social spirit is a reality." The tendency of civilization is to increase the predominance of the natural and general accord of minds.—G. TARDE, in *Revue philosophique*, November, 1901. E. C. H.

The Yakuts.—Professor Sumner has done a very excellent and serviceable piece of work in abridging, in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, the Russian work of M. Sieroshevski, who was for twelve years a political exile among the Yakuts. Without attempting an abridgment of this abridgment, it may be pointed out that the following passages on the productive and consumptive communism in property are an important contribution to our very indefinite knowledge of this subject, and, when we have in view the severe climatic conditions of the region inhabited by the Yakuts, they illustrate what seems to be a general psycho-sociological law, that crises or severe strains are favorable to the fixation of race habits: "Among the Yakuts there are *sibs*, or small groups not based on kinship so much as the convenience of sharing food obtained in larger quantities than can be used by a smaller number. They formerly lived on droves of horses, and in that distant time

we must believe that the consumption on the spot of products which had been obtained from the droves or from hunting served as the external condition of the existence and size of a *sib* group. . . . At the present time, if a Yakut slaughters an animal, all the neighbors expect a share, and the viscera, fat, and meat are divided into portions of different worth and distributed. To pass anyone over is an insult and terminates friendly relations. . . . The kumiss is spoiled in winter by the frost and in summer by the heat, and it does not bear transportation. The Yakuts have never known how to preserve meat by drying or smoking. Hence it was in the highest degree convenient for them to live in groups of such size that the kumiss and the meat obtained from the cattle and horses should be used as soon as possible. They even have a tradition that horse thieves in ancient times tried to organize themselves into bands large enough to divide and eat up, in a night, the animals they had stolen. . . . The right of private property in the house evidently did not exist among the ancient Yakuts. Even now they are inclined to regard the dwelling as a common good. Anyone who enters may stay as long as he will. A traveler has the right, according to their notions, to enter any house at any hour of the day or night, and establish himself so as to drink tea or cook food, or pass the night. The master of the house does not dare to drive out, without some important and adequate reason, even one who is offensive to him. . . . The divisions of the Yakuts are the *Ulus*, the *Nasleg*, and the *aga-ussa* (= *sib*). . . . The reallocations of land between the Naslegs within the same *Ulus* occur frequently; between the *aga-ussa* of the same *Nasleg* still more frequently; and between the allotments of the same *aga-ussa* almost every year, with the purpose of equalization. . . . The Yakuts say that the allotments to the Naslegs, within the *Ulus*, ought to be readjusted every forty years. The allotment is made by an assembly of all the officers and head men. Within the Naslegs the reallocation takes place at undefined periods, when some new necessity arises; for instance, from the necessity of setting off a glebe for the church, or when meadows have been spoiled by a freshet. . . . Individuals are constantly asking for a readjustment of allotments, upon all sorts of pleas. Leaving out of account the bits thus added or subtracted, it may be said in general that individuals dispose of their allotments without limit of time, and even give them in inheritance. In the north a certain part of the meadows is apportioned to certain homesteads. These are regarded as the inalienable property of the householder. Only gores and strips which lie farther off, or are purposely left for that purpose, are subject to division. By means of them equalization is brought about. . . . Pastures and woods are almost everywhere in the undivided use of all the inhabitants of a locality, without regard to the *aga-ussa* or *Nasleg* to which they belong. It is true that rich men in many places have divided among themselves separate cattle ranges out of the common lands, and have fenced them, but their *sib* comrades look upon such land-grabbing with disfavor, and if the rich man dies or loses influence, they try to break down his inclosures and throw open the land again. There is a strife of interest between cattle-owners and tillers; the latter inclose their lands; the former drive their cows home three times in the day. The inclosures make this journey longer. In general, the *sib* group reconciles itself to the individual disposal of a plot of land which has been won by clearing woods or meadows, or of mowing lands obtained by drying up swamps and ponds, when it has been established by prescription, and even if the appropriated land is made inheritable, provided that the plot is not large and is all utilized by the owner. But if the size is great, or the owner rents any of it, the *sib* asserts its rights. The only question then is whether the owner has won back from the land a remuneration for the labor and capital expended by him upon it. Often they undertake large clearings or drainages communally. Those who have a share in the land thus won are, first, those who lived there before; then all the *aga-ussa* of a *Nasleg* in proportion to their share in the work and their need of land."—"The Yakuts," abridged from the Russian of SIEROSHEVSKI, by W. G. SUMNER, professor of political science in Yale University, revised and completed by M. SIEROSHEVSKI, in *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 65-110. W. I. T.

The Individual and Society.—Is a society simply a group of individuals, and are all social facts to be explained by the character and activities of individuals in

their relation to external conditions, or have social facts their own peculiar and irreducible characteristics, and ought one, consequently, to attribute to society an independent reality? This question is a very general one, and is often treated both directly and by implication by sociologists. Upon the answer of this question depends much of social theory, even on its practical side. It will be of both theoretic and practical interest, therefore, if it can be shown that each of the answers commonly given has a relative value, but that neither is absolutely and exclusively true, and that it is necessary to seek the truth in a synthesis in which each finds a place.

The common characteristic of all social facts is that they are relative to the action of man toward man. The terms of the relation are the individuals; the relation itself, that is to say, the interplay of activity between the terms, constitutes the social character of the fact. The individual is the content and the social the form of this relation. From an unanalytic point of view the one appears no less real than the other; the problem of explaining and reducing apparent differences has not arisen. There is no question as to how the social fact, being, on the one side, a fact of a class of its own, appears at the same time as decomposable into elements which may harmonize or which may oppose each other. When, however, we undertake to analyze the social fact, a duality appears, the individual on one side and the social on the other. The opposition which exists in practice is not only a fact to state, but also a problem to solve. There is the task of surmounting this dualism and discovering the common measure of these different elements. Just here a special difficulty comes in. The habit of analysis is a sort of tyrant. It emphasizes the opposition which it is its function to reduce. For analysis, the two concepts of the individual and society are very distinct, and in practice they are very precisely opposed, but it is impossible to pass from the one or from the other when one wishes to render an account of the whole psychological or social reality or to conceive the ideal ends which correspond to these two objects. Consequently the more radical solutions are the more easily perceived.

The tendency is to suppress one of the terms or retain it only on condition that it can be stated in terms of the other. Either society is sacrificed to the individual or the individual to society. The sole reality is put now in the individual, now in the grouping of individuals. There are two general philosophical directions of thought, realism and idealism, and this gives us four classes of theories: (1) realistic individualism; (2) idealistic individualism; (3) realistic view of social reality; and (4) idealistic view of social reality. For the realist the individual is the living body and psychologically instinctive, being known in its relations with the material world. For the idealist the individual is the moral personality defined by its ends and tendencies, rather than by its structure and relation to the environment. To the realist the social reality is simply the *ensemble* of institutions. To the idealist there is a social consciousness with its own proper ends and with rights more inviolable than those of the individual.

The criticism of all of these theories is that they attribute a distinct existence to elements which have no separate reality. The metaphors of language give a seeming reality of their own to these abstractions, and the social theories based on them are to some extent mythical. Society has no other reality than that which we attribute to it when we see in masses refusing to seek out the elements. Neither does the individual have an independent existence. It is in the combined and reciprocal activities of a number of individuals that we should look for the social fact. The social group is not a synthesis posterior to its elements and reproducing their character. It is a primitive synthesis as necessary to its elements as they to it. The social and individual ends are indissolubly bound together. The ideal individuality is not an end in itself; it is the most apparent and, for us, the most important condition of the action; it is the means which we employ in order to clarify and vivify this solidarity of nature which is our point of departure, and which is transformed and idealized, but not annulled, by the formation of personality. These negative conclusions are not offered as a positive solution of the problem, nor does it exclude new hypotheses. It does establish certain limits within which attempts should be confined.—M. BERNÈS, "Individu et Société," in *Revue philosophique*, November, 1901.

R. C. A.